

**RECEIVED**

**From:** Jim Harper  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/20/03 1:34PM  
**Subject:** Telecommunications Competition

**SUNSHINE PERIOD**

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

I am writing as a shareowner of a Bell Operating Company that resents the FCC Commissioners mandating that I subsidize so called competitors with discounts to use bell facilities. Most of them have not even attempted to build their own facilities in the the seven years since 1996. Most take the money and run and then stiff their creditors by going bankrupt numerous times.  
Please consider this view point when you vote.

J. Harper  
St. Louis

## SUNSHINE PERIOD

**From:** Tom Keating  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioners  
**Date:** 2/20/03 1:56PM  
**Subject:** "JUST DO IT"

**RECEIVED**

MAR 18 2003

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioners:

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

If the University of Connecticut Basketball Teams ( men and women ) played the game on different rules sports would be a Telephone Company enterprise! Please change the Telecommunication Rules to be Equal for All. Make all carriers provide basic service at the same rate and not subsidize the "other teams". JUST DO IT, don't pass the basketball to the states for their individual interpretations.

Sincerely,  
Thomas R Keating

---

Upgrade Your Email - [Click here!](#)

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

**From:** dotib  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/20/03 4:05PM  
**Subject:** <No Subject>

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioner Powell,

Thank you for trying to change the rules for the telephone companies. As an employee of SBC I appreciate your efforts. Maybe some day the others will see that there is nothing fair about the way the telephone companies are forced to sell their lines and switches to telephone providers. Only when the telephone providers are required to provide their own switches and even line will there be true competition.

Again, thank you for trying to help keep our jobs.

The Butler Family  
Dallas Texas

PS..because of the vote today we have lost over 10,000 dollars in stock value. Please thank the commissioners that voted against you.

**RECEIVED**

**From:** Dick & Judy Mitchell  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/20/03 4:18PM  
**Subject:** What a MESS! ! !

**SUNSHINE PERIOD**

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

What a mess you have created by passing the responsibility off to the state! This is a time when we should be moving to speed up the regulatory to match the speed of technology and now, because your committee did not want to make a decision, you pass it off to the States. Just what we need, more regulators involved. This is like a cancer in the communications network. Please reconsider your decision!

**From:** Otis Viles  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/20/03 5:56PM  
**Subject:** Apology

**SUNSHINE PERIOD****RECEIVED**

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

I believe I owe you an apology. I just downloaded and read your comments on today's ruling. As a body, I believe the FCC committed a huge mistake for consumers. As an individual, it appears you think as I do about the potential harm to consumers in eliminating line-sharing with the new broadband suppliers.

Otis Viles

## SUNSHINE PERIOD

**From:** David Heath  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** 2/20/03 5:58PM  
**Subject:** thanks for destroying DSL!

Hi,

I just read about your decision to no longer require the bells to allow other companies to offer DSL over their lines. I use earthlink DSL because I have had extremely bad luck with BellSouth even for telephone service and don't see how they could manage DSL. I don't trust them to support my DSL and many others agree with me as evidenced by the many people using non-bell DSL solutions.

Have you given any thought to the consumer at all?

Thanks.

-dave heath

**CC:** David Heath

**RECEIVED**

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**From:** Jim Byrne  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/20/03 5:59PM  
**Subject:** RBOC Decisions

## SUNSHINE PERIOD

Your anti RBOC rulings continue to erode the retirement plans of thousands of Telephone Workers. Your attempts to "even the playing field" in the industry have proven disastrous to the equity value of the major RBOCS. Would not our system benefit in the long run on letting the market determine its own destiny?

J. W. Byrne

**RECEIVED**

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**SUNSHINE PERIOD****RECEIVED**

**From:** Josef Novak  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/20/03 6:14PM  
**Subject:** telecom

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Nice going... You guys are a pack of idiots. You just killed capex spending by the only ones able to do it - the Bells - to bring innovation and stability to that market. Now if these players at the helm begin to go under, leaving a death spiral for control of assets, you can pat yourselves on the back for being the enemies of the consumers when the telecom industry mirrors the Canadian healthcare system.

It just keeps getting worse in this country. Between the Enrons and bureaucrats like you guys, we should be at Dow 5000 before the end of the year.



**From:** IRELAND, BOB (SBCSI)  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/20/03 6:34PM  
**Subject:** Today ruling

**SUNSHINE PERIOD**

**RECEIVED**

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

I want to thank the commissioners for their vote today. My 401k has dropped by more than 5000.00 dollars. I work for SBC and can now look forward to another round or two of layoffs.

Bob Ireland  
Vantive Client Administrator  
and  
TPS Support

925 823-0528

Please Visit our website <http://vantive.sbc.com/>

**RECEIVED**

**From:** Bill Mund  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/20/03 6:35PM  
**Subject:** It's just stupid!

**SUNSHINE PERIOD**

**MAR 18 2003**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Commissioner Powell, thank you for your efforts to "level the playing field." Today's outcome is simply stupid! Again, government that cannot get anything done. Half-assed ideas. Half-assed thinking.

Bill Mund  
An SBC, VZ shareholder

**From:** Wayne Kleeschulte  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/20/03 6:38PM  
**Subject:** Level Playing Field

**SUNSHINE PERIOD****RECEIVED**

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Wayne Kleeschulte  
3112 Flintlock Path  
St. Charles, MO 63301

Dear Chairman Powell,

I sent the following letter late in 2002. I wrote in the hope that your colleagues would be as enlightened as you in dealing with the problem of upstart competitors in the telecommunication's business being able to lease lines from the local phone companies at ridiculous discounts. Obviously they are not, and are obviously suffering from a serious, if not fatal case of Rectal Cranial Insertion!!! Commonly referred to as HIA!!! Considering today's decision, I'm not too sure your 'colleagues' are bright enough to understand what I just said, but if any would like a detailed description I'll be happy to tutor them personally.. I hope the decision they made allows them to sleep at night, although I hope it doesn't.. If that sounds mean that's good, because it doesn't scratch the surface of the anger I feel toward them for the wrong headed decision they made today. They obviously don't give a damn about the PEOPLE they have hurt. These companies are made up of REAL PEOPLE whose jobs and pensions have been placed in jeopardy by the lack of foresight and sense of fairness they have demonstrated in today's decision. It's a shame that the local telephone service will now be left to deteriorate. What incentive is there, and where will the money come from, for the Baby Bells to maintain their facilities to provide the kind of quality service the public has come to expect?? How sad that three people can destroy what has taken years to build, hurt so many people, and do so with impunity.. <sad sigh> I thank you for your farsighted and appropriate vote, and wish you well. As I stated earlier, if any of the other members ( I hesitate to call them your colleagues) want the tutoring they obviously need, I hope they will not hesitate to give me a call. I doubt that will happen though, as their cases of HIA appear to be so severe as to require surgery first. Besides, I'm not sure they would understand even one on one, as they don't seem to be able to grasp a simple thing like: LEVEL PLAYING FIELD.. <DUH!!!> Thank you for your forward thinking, fair vote and keep up the good work. I can't wait for the day when the other members' phones quit working and there's no one left to fix them.. Thank you again.

Wayne Kleeschulte  
Tel. 636-946-7778  
Cell 314-402-9323

---

As a retired 30 year manager at Southwestern Bell, I have seen many changes in the telecommunications industry. Some of these were obviously needed to provide competition after the breakup of AT&T. But now the pendulum has swung too far, and it is time to level the playing field for the local phone companies like Southwestern and others. It is time for regulators to change pricing rules that allow rivals to lease parts of these companies' networks at a discount. SBC has lost 751,000 local telephone lines to competitors who leased components of its network at a discount to provide service. SBC and the others in similar situations have continued to respond aggressively by reducing costs, and this of course has resulted in lost jobs. But no amount of cost-cutting can offset the effects of rules that require a company to sell their lines and related services to competitors below cost. At some point the well will run dry, and then it will be too late to save the best telecommunications service in the world!! Not only will the local companies like SBC go under, but all of their competitors who will be without service to sell, will of course follow. That makes no sense at all!! SBC and the others are not asking for the kind of preferential treatment that has been given their competitors, they are just asking regulators to do the right thing and

level the playing field. I sincerely hope that both The FCC and state regulators act to correct this inequity before it is too late.

Sincerely,

Wayne Kleeschulte

**CC:** Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB

**RECEIVED**

**SUNSHINE PERIOD**

**MAR 18 2003**

**From:** Jim Harper  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/20/03 6:39PM  
**Subject:** Telecommunications ruling

**Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary**

The action of Commissioner Martin on today's ruling is in direct opposition of the President's agenda for an economic recovery stimulus in the telecommunications sector. Many retired people living off their investments saw their savings wiped out today.  
Jim Harper

RECEIVED

MAR 18 2003

## SUNSHINE PERIOD

**From:** MCGAW-GREEN, PAMELA (SBCSI)  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/20/03 6:44PM  
**Subject:** Today's ruling

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

FCC Commissioners:

I would like to express my deep dissatisfaction and concern with the today's decision that allows long distance carriers to continue to rape the incumbent phone companies. I just have to shake my head every time I think that some of you would actually be in favor of this. It is laughable to think you refer to this as competition. Unfair competition, yes!

Maybe you have already seen this letter before. It was written to a newspaper in Dallas. Please explain to me the difference between what is in the letter below and what is happening to the incumbent telephone companies.

Dear Sir,

I have a great idea to "promote" competition within the Postal system. After reading so many complaints about the price of stamps, poor service, etc, from the USPS, I believe that I can do it better. I can reduce the cost of a stamp to 30 cents, ensure that my customers have a priority over existing USPS customers, and receive payments from the USPS whenever the mail for my customers is late, damaged, or delivered to the wrong address.

You see, I will just lobby for the FCC and various legislative bodies of the US and State governments that continue to uphold UNE-P as it applies to telecommunications to oversee the USPS as well. I will receive postage stamps for 16 cents and resell them for 30 cents. I will use the USPS mail trucks, sorting facilities, mail carriers, planes, post office boxes, post office's, etc, which the USPS will pay to maintain, to deliver my mail. I will require the USPS to deliver to my customers FIRST, and require the USPS to pay me whenever the mail is late to these customers. If the Postmaster General makes any noise about correcting this situation, I will run damaging radio, TV and magazine ads disparaging the USPS service, financial status and employees. I even thought of a name for this company, Mail Carriers Inc.

But I will be saving as much money as possible during these boom times, for I know, as any other fool can see, that the USPS would only be able to carry this burden for so long, before going under. And the where would I be? Well, It wouldn't be my fault, now, would it? It was the USPS that went under, not I. Maybe congress could bail ME out.

I know how sarcastic this sounds, but as I examine the UNE-P regulations that force the Baby Bells to resale their lines at a loss, I wonder just how long it will take to completely destroy the infrastructure that has cost the Bells so much to develop over the years. I think people take for granted that tone they hear when they pick up the phone, and just how much work and pride had been taken to get that tone there.

I sure hope that both the public's and the government's attitude's change on this, before it's too late.

James Warwick  
Garland, Texas

> Pam McGaw-Green  
1303 Muleshoe Pass

San Antonio, TX 78258  
210-481-1585

**RECEIVED**

**From:** Jim  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/20/03 7:17PM  
**Subject:** Thank you for your dissent

**SUNSHINE PERIOD** MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Mr Powell,

I am a telecom employee and today's decision by the FCC places my future at risk. I agree that there should be a fair playing field for competitors. Given your detail dissent and your feelings concerning the future of telecom and what has not worked to this point, I feel confident that your dissent and the multitude of litigation that I feel will occur as states come to different answers on similar issues occurs will be the 20/20 vision discussed years from now when the telecom market is a fraction of what is today. I can only hope that this does not provide a national weakness in our communications structure that will subject us to attack.

Unfortunately, some of your peers have made the cry that competition exists after today's order, but at what cost? The sharing of one company's facilities to subsidize another's business makes no sense, measured from the core of American business and know-how. Again, we are in a situation where everyone will continue to lose, ILECs, CLECs, equipment makers stockholders and consumers. It takes a long time to build out plant but that is the purpose of competition, to earn the right to win, not be given the (empty) victory. Now, competitors will focus on arbitrage versus the real prize, innovation.

I applaud your efforts to correct the prior decisions. As an average American, I will always support Government stepping aside to allow for the American way of life; I do not believe that happened today. Today's decision has allowed for more regulation than we have seen in the past concerning telecom, only shifted to the states, where the expertise and knowledge will be more diverse, along with the opinions that will become law, and make a complex industry that more confusing to the average American.

In closing, if this is going to be the direction of the FCC, I ask that all communications industries, cable, satellite, internet etc. be subject to the same restrictive policies that the telecom industry is subject. If today's error will remain, let it be an error that all communications industries must live by, not just one. Allow the entire communications market be subject to this and experience the high level regulation RBOCs must sustain in order to operate. Let's see how well they adjust to it. It is only fair.

Thanks you for your time,

James A. Bilda

JAB

---

Do you Yahoo!?  
Yahoo! Tax Center - forms, calculators, tips, and more



**From:** Kathy Pankow  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/20/03 7:19PM  
**Subject:** thank you for your courage

**SUNSHINE PERIOD****RECEIVED**

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Mr. Powell,  
Thank you for your courage in rendering a partial dissent on the ruling today against the Baby Bells. I can't believe 3 other people believed it is better to hand down the decisions for the states to make, because they didn't have enough guts to make the decisions themselves. Shame on all of them. My state, Wisconsin, HATES SBC and I know now will do everything in their power to see them go out of business, at the loss of many thousands of jobs. How many years will we have to continue to lease out our lines to the competitors at no profit to ourselves? I guess it will continue until SBC is finally forced out of business, which is what these 3 other people in the FCC really want. I pray there will be a court challenge, and again I thank you for your dissent today. You are just as courageous and intelligent as your father! Thank you for trying to stand up for our lives and our livelihoods as employees of one of the Baby Bells.  
God bless you,  
Kathy Pankow

---

Do you Yahoo!?  
Yahoo! Tax Center - forms, calculators, tips, more  
<http://taxes.yahoo.com/>

**SUNSHINE PERIOD**

**From:** Robert V. Kline  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, kmjmweb@fcc.gov, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** 2/20/03 7:20PM  
**Subject:** BOC changes

**RECEIVED**

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

While the rule changes today do seem to encourage the BOCs to build new infrastructure rather than just charge more for existing infrastructure, they come up a bit short in terms of encouraging broadband competition.

Seeing rate increases from the sole broadband provider in our area ( satellite is available everywhere in the US, but is not cost competitive ), I am painfully aware that there is no competition.

Is this the best the FCC can do to encourage competition in such an important area?

-R. Kline

**From:** Richard Parry  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/20/03 7:42PM  
**Subject:** <No Subject>

## SUNSHINE PERIOD

**RECEIVED**

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Mr. Powell -

Thank you for your efforts to move the telecom and tech industries forward. I fear that the resolution today will not aid productivity advancement, nor create jobs - important stimulants for an economy in deep trouble. Keep battling on our behalf.

Cheers,

Richard Parry  
poet2@cox.net

**From:** Thomas Richards  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/20/03 8:08PM  
**Subject:** new rules

**SUNSHINE PERIOD**

**RECEIVED**

**MAR 18 2003**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Mr. Powell,

Thanks for trying to resolve the unfair obligations that the baby bells have to put up with. As a retired Verizon employee and share holder of that company and others, it would be nice to have all the commissioners get their ducks in order. Don't give up.

Tom Richards

**From:** Skip  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** 2/20/03 8:10PM  
**Subject:** Congratulations on your decision.

**SUNSHINE PERIOD****RECEIVED**

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

On the FCC's decision to remove competition from the DSL market. Congratulations on the destruction of consumer choice in broadband. I can only assume that this is to give the FCC greater control over the communications of US citizens.

Further, considering the foot-dragging and poor service that local telcos have to date treated DSL with, there is no way that this can be construed as good for DSL competition with cable. Your next step, I predict, will be to throw obstacles in the way of other types of access (specifically, wireless). I expect you to do this under the auspices of 'homeland security'.

I hope to also congratulate you on your unemployment in the future, as you obviously serve large corporate interests and not the US consumer...

Unless you believe that choice is BAD for the consumer - in which case you are still too foolish to occupy your position. Of course, since the current administration is virulently anti-consumer, you probably have at least two years before your removal, so enjoy your ride.

Your detonation of non-cable / non-local telco ISPs will cost the US even more jobs, and damage the economy further. Can you possibly imagine that concentrating the money supply into fewer hands means that more people will have access to it? Errant nonsense!

You sold the American people down the river. You betray the American Dream. Enjoy your sleep, if you can.

Al Batz  
President, Dynamic Solutions  
Edison, NJ

**SUNSHINE PERIOD**

**From:** Salvo131@aol.com  
**To:** JoBeSaeBe2@aol.com, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** 2/20/03 9:16PM  
**Subject:** how is it possible you can vote against the growth of america

**RECEIVED**

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Hi, I am a worker for verizon, and I was so very disappointed when these rules that you have enforced have failed the system.

By applying all these regulation, the Baby Bells have said that they will not spend money to upgrade the plant. These only means that honest working Americans like myself will lose their job on top of the rest of the communication workers that have been let go already.

By reversing these rules, you would have forced these other companies to invest in new thecnology, and the baby bells to upgrade their desentigrating systems, so thousand of jobs would have been created.

What are we afraid to do, are we afraid that companies that have stolen billions of dollars, like MCIWORLD.COM would go bankrupt? or AT & T would have to invest in the local busness? these rule today was a slap on the face to every hard working american. These rules might save as a few dollors a month now, but at the cost of hundred of thousand of jobs in the future.

thank you for notting

**RECEIVED****SUNSHINE PERIOD****MAR 18 2003**

**From:** Peggy Small  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/20/03 9:39PM  
**Subject:** dissent

**Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary**

I applaud your written statement today on the Triennial Review.

I have worked hard in the communications industry for over 30 years. In recent years I have seen the loss of jobs, the collapse of many retirement plans and many bankruptcies. I also think we have put our communication within this country at risk in our current world security dilemma. I also believe in competition, but not when it puts our country at risk.

Government agencies should not have the right to determine the price of products company's sells. The market should determine the price. There are still a lot of poor people in this country that need phones and a lot of rural folks, especially in many of the southern states of our country where it is very costly to provide service. These new companies that are being given these reduced rates are not interested in providing this type of service (and never will be). They are only interested in taking the high dollar end customers. With all of the cellular competition disconnecting landline type phones, cable TVs and internets providing an alternative to the old phone companies, and all of the CLECs that have been given, by our government, a way to create a business that also takes market away from the existing ILECs, how can anyone say there is not competition in this market.

The only reason we have won wars in the past and will in the future is because of our superior communications infrastructure. What controls are place on companies that have all of their money, most of their employees and all of their offices overseas? There is no way this country can monitor and control these companies in times of national security. It cannot mobilize the required manpower to respond to national disasters.

We are creating a bureaucracy that will ultimately fail, but it may last long enough to bring this country down. With the states controlling what can and cannot be provided or charged, we are creating a breeding ground for corruption by having so many providers that are willing to do anything to make money. This includes political payoffs.

Sometimes regulation is a good thing, for the security of a country.

Terry Small